UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/542,585	01/06/2006	Ingo Hutter	PD030010	6952

24498   7590   02/10/2009

Robert D. Shedd
Thomson Licensing LLC
PO Box 5312
PRINCETON, NJ 08543-5312

EXAMINER
BOUTAH, ALINA A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2443	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
02/10/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/542,585	HUTTER ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	ALINA N. BOUTAH	2443

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *07 January 2009*.
2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-9* is/are pending in the application.
     4a) Of the above claim(s) *9* is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) *1-8* is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *29 December 2003* is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
     a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
         1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
         2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
         3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
     * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date *7/19/05; 7/28/06*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election with traverse of claims 1-8 in the reply filed on January 7, 2009 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that the inventions are directed to a method and an apparatus and that there is only a single embodiment. This is not found persuasive because the inventions are distinct.

Claim 1 recites:

A method for providing an <u>input parameter</u> from a network station in a network of a first type for a network of a second type, which is connected via a gateway to the network of the first type, wherein the network station which relates to the input parameter is first of all **registered** by the gateway in the network of the second type, in that the input parameter is **mapped** onto an information element which is known in the network of the second type, and the network station which relates to the input parameter is then **once again registered** in the network of the second type.

Claim 2 recites:

A connection unit for connection of a network of a first type to a network of a second type, having **logging-off** means which, when the information relating to the change to an <u>input parameter</u> for a network station in the network of the first type is input, results in the network station which relates to the input parameter being logged-off in the network of the second type, having **conversion** means for conversion of the changed input parameter to a format which is suitable for the network of the second type, and having **logging-on** means which, after conversion of the input parameter, once again result in the network station which relates to the changed input parameter being logged on in the network of the second type.

As evidenced from above, the only element the claims have in common is the input parameter. As the language of the claims are vague and confusing, claim 1 is summarized as a method for providing an input parameter from a network station by a bridge in which the input is registered, mapped, and registered again. Claim 9 is summarized as a connection unit in which an input is logged off converted, and logged on. Logging on and off are not the same as registering.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Information Disclosure Statement

The IDS submitted 7/19/05 and 7/28/06 have been considered. It is noted that the reference DE 102 27 062 A1 has not been considered because it is not in English and there is no translation for it.

The listing of references in the specification (i.e. EP 02 090 147.6) is not a proper information disclosure statement. 37 CFR 1.98(b) requires a list of all patents, publications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office, and MPEP § 609.04(a) states, "the list may not be incorporated into the specification but must be submitted in a separate paper." Therefore, unless the references have been cited by the examiner on form PTO-892, they have not been considered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 is vague and confusing. The claim recites: "a method for providing an input parameter from a network station in a network of a first type for a network of a second type, which is connected via a gateway to the network of the first type, wherein the network station which *relates* to the input parameter is first of all ***registered by the gateway in the network of the second type***, in that the input parameter is mapped onto an information element which is known in the network of the second type, and the network station which *relates* to the input parameter is then once again registered in the network of the second type."

It is unclear as to what is intended by "relate" and which network station (station in the first or second network) is performing the relating task. Also, it is unclear whether the gateway is part of the first or second network or in between. A clarification is requested.

Claim 2 recites "the HAVi Standard." There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 4 recites the limitation "the logging on and logging off" in the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 5 recites "the user-defined name," and "the parameter UserPreferredName." There are insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claim.

Claim 6 recites "the information element FriendlyName." There is insufficient

antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Henry et

al. (US 2005/0078679).

Regarding claim 1, Henry teaches a method for providing an input parameter

from a network station in a network of a first type (HAVi device 1) for a network of a

second type (UpnP device 3), which is connected via a gateway (abstract – bridge

connecting first sub-network to second sub-network; HAVi-UpnP bridge 5) to the

network of the first type, wherein the network station which relates to the input

parameter is first of all registered by the gateway in the network of the second type, in

that the input parameter is mapped onto an information element which is known in the

network of the second type [table 1], and the network station which relates to the input

parameter is then once again registered in the network of the second type (figures 6

and 7).

Regarding claim 2, Henry teaches the method as claimed in claim 1, according to

which the network of the first type is a network which is based on the HAVi Standard,

where HAVi stands for Home Audio/Video Interoperability (figure 4: HAVi device 1).

Regarding claim 3, Henry teaches the method as claimed in claim 1, in which the

network of the second type is a network which is based on the Internet Protocol, in

particular UpnP, where UPnP stands for Universal Plug and Play (figure 3: UpnP

device 3).

Regarding claim 4, Henry teaches the method as claimed in claim 1, in which the

logging-off and logging-on again of the network station which relates to the input

parameter are carried out in accordance with the Simple Service Discovery Protocol

SSDP, in particular using the ssdp::byebye logging-off message and the ssdp::alive

logging-on message [0057; table 1].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 5-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Henry in view of Dara-Abrams et al. US 6,456,892).

Regarding claim 5, Henry fails to explicitly teach the method as claimed in claim

3, in which the input parameter relates to the user-defined name of an HAVi network

station, in particular to the parameter UserPreferredName. In an analogous art, Dara-

Abrams teaches an input parameter relating to user-defined name having an HAVi

network station, in particular to the parameter UserPreferredName (col. 36, lines 10-

16). At the time the invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would have

been motivated to employ UserPreferredName parameter in order to allow the user to

name the parameter according to his or her preferences, thus giving the user more

control of the device.

Regarding claim 6, Henry teaches the method as claimed in claim 5, in which the

input parameter is mapped onto the information element of an XML appliance

description for the HAVi network station which relates to the input parameter [table 1].

However, Henry does not explicitly teach wherein the UserPreferredName is mapped

onto the information element FriendlyName of an appliance description for the HAVi

network station which relates to the input parameter. In an analogous art, Dara-

Abrams teaches an input parameter relating to user-defined name having an HAVi

network station, in particular to the parameter UserPreferredName (col. 36, lines 10-

16). At the time the invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would have

been motivated to employ UserPreferredName parameter in order to allow the user to

name the parameter according to his or her preferences, thus giving the user more

control of the device.

Regarding claim 7, Henry fails to explicitly teach the method as claimed in claim

1, in which a text input menu is provided for user-defined inputting of the input

parameter from a network station and is overlaid on a display unit, and onto which the

current text of the selected text field is overlaid, with the text being input with the aid of

the number keys on a remote control. However, Dara-Abrams teaches this deficiency

in figure 7. At the time the invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would

have been motivated to combine the teaching of Henry with the teaching of Dara-

Abrams in order to allow user to easily define the device according to his or her

preference.

Regarding claim 8, Henry fails to explicitly teach the method as claimed in claim

7, in which the text input menu is implemented as part of the user interface of an HAVi

network appliance, which is started by pushing a text input key, and with a check being

carried out after the text input key has been pressed to determine whether a text input

field is focused. Dara-Abrams teaches this deficiency in col. 9, line to col. 10, line 17.

At the time the invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been

motivated to combine the teaching of Henry with the teaching of Dara-Abrams in order

to allow user to easily define the device according to his or her preference.

Conclusion

It is noted that the column, line, and/or page number citations used in the prior art

references as applied by the Examiner to the claimed invention are for the convenience

of the Applicant to represent the relevant teachings of the prior art. The prior art

references may contain further teachings and/or suggestions that may further

distinguish the citations applied to the claims, therefore, the Applicant should consider

the entirety of these prior art references during the process of responding to this Office

Action. It is further noted that any alternative and non-preferred embodiments as taught

and/or suggested within the prior art references also constitute prior art and the prior art

references may be relied upon for all the teachings would have reasonably suggested to

one of ordinary skill in the art. See MPEP 2123.

The prior art listed in the PT0-892 form included with this Office Action disclose

methods, systems, and apparatus similar to those claimed and recited in the

specification. The Examiner has cited these references to evidence the level and/or

knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to

provide support for universal facts and the technical reasoning for the rejections made

in this Office Action including the Examiner's broadest reasonable interpretation of the

claims as required by MPEP 2111 and to evidence the plain meaning of any terms not

defined in the specification that are interpreted by the Examiner in accordance with

MPEP 2111.01. The Applicant should consider these cited references when preparing a

response to this Office Action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to ALINA N. BOUTAH whose telephone number is

(571)272-3908. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday (9:00 am

- 5:00 pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Tonia L.M. Dollinger can be reached on 571-272-4170. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-

273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Alina N Boutah/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2443